Document 60

Filed 02/20/2008

Page 1 of 3

Case 3:07-cv-05634-CRB

27

28

Pursuant to Local Rule 3-12, Plaintiff Mark Foy submits this administrative motion to consider whether *Foy v. Air New Zealand, et al.*, Case No. CV-07-6219 (EDL), a putative class action lawsuit filed on December 7, 2007, should be related to *Donald Wortman, et al. v. Air New Zealand Ltd., et al.*, Case No. CV-07-5634 (CRB), filed on November 6, 2007.

Local Rule 3-12(a) provides that actions are related when:

- (1) The actions concern substantially the same parties, property, transaction or event; and
- (2) It appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different Judges.

The *Foy* and the *Wortman* actions satisfy that criteria. Each case is a proposed class action alleging a conspiracy to fix, raise, maintain and/or stabilize the prices for long-haul passenger transportation services on transpacific flights to and from the United States, and to fix fuel surcharges on such transportation. Each case involves substantially the same defendants, who are many of the major airlines providing long-haul passenger transportation services on transpacific flights to and from the United States. This Court has already found that three other similar actions are related to the *Wortman* action, and on February 19, 2008, the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation issued an order centralizing all related actions before this Court. Were *Foy* to proceed independently, it would result in a tremendous amount of duplicative motions and discovery concerning the same questions of fact and law involved in *Wortman* and related cases, and would create the unnecessary risk of inconsistent results.

Accordingly, *Foy* should be ordered related to *Wortman* pursuant to Local Rule 3-12(f), and *Foy* assigned to the Honorable Charles R. Breyer, the judge assigned to *Wortman*. It appears highly likely that there would be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor, expense, and/or conflicting result if the two putative class actions were tried before different judges.

Copies of the respective complaints are attached the accompanying Declaration of Aaron M. Sheanin as Exhibits A and B.

- 1		
1	Accordingly, the cases should be considered related within the meaning of Local Rule 3-	
2	12(a).	
3		
4	DATED: February 20, 2008	GIRARD GIBBS LLP
5		/s/ Aaron M. Sheanin
6		Daniel C. Girard
7		Elizabeth Pritzker
8		Steven G. Tidrick
		601 California Street, 14 th Floor San Francisco, California 94104
9		Telephone: (415) 981-4800
10		Facsimile: (415) 981-4846
11		Attorneys for Plaintiff Mark Foy
12		Anorneys for I taining Mark Poy
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		